



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/026,403 | 12/21/2001 | Lawrence R. Miller | 36287-02001 | 2495 |

27171 7590 03/13/2007
MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MCCLOY
1 CHASE MANHATTAN PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10005-1413

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2137

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS | 03/13/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,403

Applicant(s)

MILLER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Pyzocha

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are pending.
2. Response filed 02/20/2007 has been received and considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al (US 6584505) in view of Gupta et al (US 6226752) and further in view of Grandcolas et al (EP 1089516).

As per claims 1, 9-13, 17, and 20, Howard et al discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system (see column 8 lines 52-53); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system (see column 8 lines 54-56); retrieving, at the first system,

Art Unit: 2137

information corresponding to a possible session credential for the second system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system (see column 6, lines 51-52); the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (see column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57).

Howard et al fails to disclose the use of session token and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system and both the first and that both the first and second system have protected resources.

However, Gupta et al teaches the use of session credentials (see column 11 lines 10-25) and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid credential with the second system and both the first (see column 11 line 39 through column 13 line

Art Unit: 2137

40) while Grandcolas et al teaches both the first and second system have protected resources(see page 2 paragraph [0006]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the session token, the inputting and granting of Gupta et al and for both systems to provide protected resources as taught by Grandcolas et al in the system of Howard et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to provide a single sign on solution for the web (see Gupta et al column 6 lines 46-51) and to provide a single sign on user access to multiple web servers (see Grandcolas et al Abstract).

As per claims 2 and 14, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses granting a session credential to the client by the first system, after determining that the client has a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 6).

As per claim 3, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses sending a session token to the client, the token corresponding to a session credential granted by the first system (see Gupta column 11 line 39 through column 13 line 40).

Art Unit: 2137

As per claim 4, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses a method comprising directing the client to the second system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57).

As per claim 5, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses directing the client to the first system to establish a session credential based on successful authentication at the second system, after determining that the client does not have a valid session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57).

As per claims 6 and 15, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses maintaining the client session credential granted by the second system (see Howard column 9, lines 6-14).

As per claim 8, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses retrieving information from the session token held by the client comprises: sending a query to the client from the first system, the query including identification as originating from a domain name corresponding

Art Unit: 2137

to the second system; and receiving a response to the query (see Howard column 8, lines 8-11).

As per claims 16 and 19, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses associating session credentials for the first system and the second system with the client (see Howard column 7, lines 12-25).

As per claims 18 and 21, the modified Howard et al, Gupta et al and Grandcolas et al system discloses granting the client session credentials for the first system (see Howard column 7, lines 54-63).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 02/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues the motivation provided is insufficient and that the proposed combination would destroy the teachings of Howard.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the motivation provided is insufficient, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In*

Art Unit: 2137

re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the portion of Gupta cited for motivation states that the single sign on solution is for web applications and in the paragraph following the cited motivation it is described that these applications include such things as email, word processing and ATM functions. Therefore it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that providing a single sign on system for web applications is advantageous because a user would not have to enter a password for every different type of application accessing the web whereas Howard is related to a single sign on session for a single application (the web browser). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Gupta with Howard. Moving now to Grandcolas, the cited motivation is to provide a single sign on system to multiple web servers, in this cited portion it is also stated that the user is authentication at a first web server as opposed to a dedicated authentication server and that the first (and second) web server each has its own functionality. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that using web servers, which provide a service, as opposed to a dedicated authentication server would reduce overhead by allowing for a multifunctional server. As shown in the above

Art Unit: 2137

response, each of the three cited references relate to a single sign on system and each of the modifications provide some benefit or advantage over the individual systems so the motivation and combination is proper.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the proposed combination would destroy the teachings of Howard, Applicant merely states what Howard teaches and makes a general allegation that these teaching are, "in direct conflict with the proposed modifications" but provides no evidence of such conflict. As stated in the above rejection (with respect to the claim language), Howard discloses inputting at a first system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication, a request from a client to access a protected resource on the first system (see column 8 lines 52-53); determining at the first system that a client does not have a valid session credential granted by the first system (see column 8 lines 54-56); retrieving, at the first system, information corresponding to a possible session credential for the second system that grants session credentials based on successful authentication at the second system (see column 6, lines 51-52); the first system presenting at least some of the information from the session token to the second system; (see column 6, lines 51-52 and column 8, lines 54-57), fails to disclose the use of session

Art Unit: 2137

token and the first system inputting a determination from the second system that the client has valid a valid credential with the second system and the first system granting access to the protected resource on the first system to the client based on the determination from the second system that the client has a valid session credential with the second system and both the first and that both the first and second system have protected resources. These final limitations are what Gupta and Grandcolas are relied upon to teach. Furthermore, both Howard and Gupta relate to a single sign on system with use of an authentication server (login server in Gupta). Furthermore, Gupta teaches (as exemplified by Figure 3) that if a user does not have a valid session it obtains one with the login server and the login server redirects the system back to the application server with the session token of the login server (the second system). Next, Grandcolas teaches that the location where authentication is provided (i.e. the authentication or login server) also provides a service; nowhere in Howard or Gupta does it state that their authentication/login server cannot provide other functionality. Also as discussed above one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modifications to Howard: Therefore, the combination does

Art Unit: 2137

not destroy the functionality of Howard and the rejection under 35 USC 103 is proper.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

Art Unit: 2137

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER